177 to the helplessness of the survivors, the extraordinarily strong
731 influence that was exerted upon them immediately after the disaster
[177] by Bishop Hand (resulting in many becoming mission teachers, the building of a church of especially high quality, scrupulous school-going by the children and other signs of compliance), stronger pressure than usual to succeed in skilled occupations, a more profound reappraisal of ideology under the impact of disaster as well as church influence, and finally the availability of more cash-cropping land than at Sasembata, as a result of depletion of the population.

In Sivepa, where little loss of life occurred, the pattern of changes differs from that in Inonda, but the difference may well be largely explainable by the superior facilities introduced, especially by the mission, into the Sasembata area as a response by the Anglican authorities to the disaster.

177 The paradox of Papuan culture change is its dependence on
369 migration out of the rural areas. The striking changes of ideology seem to result always from travel and contact between the men who have been away and those who have stayed at home. In the district itself, the progressives are always those with outside experience. In Hohorita, these progressives had more varied and deeper experiences (perhaps because the home base was destroyed) and those who were urbanised continued constant contact with the village. Rural development has opened up some new economic opportunities, and the improvement of school services is opening up further opportunities, but it is only the returning traveller who understands these opportunities and leads his people in realising them. Relocation provides opportunities for village renewal and these opportunities are seized upon by the natural innovators within the villages (the returned migrants) to hasten the coming of the New Day.